

Undirected Graph Theory

Chelsea Edmonds

January 31, 2023

Abstract

This entry presents a general library for undirected graph theory - enabling reasoning on simple graphs and undirected graphs with loops. It primarily builds off Noschinski's basic ugraph definition [4], however generalises it in a number of ways and significantly expands on the range of basic graph theory definitions formalised. Notably, this library removes the constraint of vertices being a type synonym with the natural numbers which causes issues in more complex mathematical reasoning using graphs, such as the Balog Szemerédi Gowers theorem which this library is used for. Secondly this library also presents a locale-centric approach, enabling more concise, flexible, and reusable modelling of different types of graphs. Using this approach enables easy links to be made with more expansive formalisations of other combinatorial structures, such as incidence systems, as well as various types of formal representations of graphs. Further inspiration is also taken from Noschinski's [5] Directed Graph library for some proofs and definitions on walks, paths and cycles, however these are much simplified using the set based representation of graphs, and also extended on in this formalisation.

Contents

1	Undirected Graph Theory Basics	3
1.1	Miscellaneous Extras	3
1.2	Initial Set up	4
1.3	Graph System Locale	6
1.4	Undirected Graph with Loops	7
1.5	Edge Density	13
1.6	Simple Graphs	14
1.7	Subgraph Basics	16
2	Walks, Paths and Cycles	18
2.1	Walks	19
2.2	Paths	22
2.3	Cycles	23

3	Connectivity	24
3.1	Connecting Walks and Paths	24
3.2	Vertex Connectivity	26
3.3	Graph Properties on Connectivity	27
3.4	We define a connected graph as a non-empty graph (the empty set is not usually considered connected by convention), where the vertex set is connected	30
4	Girth and Independence	33
5	Triangles in Graph	35
5.1	Preliminaries on Triangles in Graphs	35
6	Bipartite Graphs	38
6.1	Bipartite Set Up	38
6.2	Bipartite Graph Locale	39
7	Graph Theory Inheritance	42
7.1	Design Inheritance	43
7.2	Adjacency Relation Definition	43

Acknowledgements

Chelsea Edmonds is jointly funded by the Cambridge Trust (Cambridge Australia Scholarship) and a Cambridge Department of Computer Science and Technology Premium Research Studentship. The ALEXANDRIA project is funded by the European Research Council, Advanced Grant GA 742178.

This library aims to present a general theory for undirected graphs. The formalisation approach models edges as sets with two elements, and is inspired in part by the graph theory basics defined by Lars Noschinski in [4] which are used in [2, 1]. Crucially this library makes the definition more flexible by removing the type synonym from vertices to natural numbers. This is limiting in more advanced mathematical applications, where it is common for vertices to represent elements of some other set. It additionally extends significantly on basic graph definitions.

The approach taken in this formalisation is the "locale-centric" approach for modelling different graph properties, which has been successfully used in other combinatorial structure formalisations.

1 Undirected Graph Theory Basics

This first theory focuses on the basics of graph theory (vertices, edges, degree, incidence, neighbours etc), as well as defining a number of different types of basic graphs. This theory draws inspiration from [4, 2, 1]

theory *Undirected-Graph-Basics* **imports** *Main HOL-Library.Multiset HOL-Library.Disjoint-Sets*

HOL-Library.Extended-Real Girth-Chromatic.Girth-Chromatic-Misc
begin

1.1 Miscellaneous Extras

Useful concepts on lists and sets

lemma *distinct-tl-rev*:

assumes *hd xs = last xs*

shows *distinct (tl xs) \longleftrightarrow distinct (tl (rev xs))*

<proof>

lemma *last-in-list-set*: *length xs \geq 1 \implies last xs \in set (xs)*

<proof>

lemma *last-in-list-tl-set*:

assumes *length xs \geq 2*

shows *last xs \in set (tl xs)*

<proof>

lemma *length-list-decomp-lt*: *ys \neq [] \implies length (xs @zs) $<$ length (xs@ys@zs)*

<proof>

lemma *obtains-Max*:

assumes *finite A and A \neq {}*

obtains *x where x \in A and Max A = x*

<proof>

lemma *obtains-MAX*:
assumes *finite A and* $A \neq \{\}$
obtains x **where** $x \in A$ **and** $Max (f \text{ ` } A) = f x$
<proof>

lemma *obtains-Min*:
assumes *finite A and* $A \neq \{\}$
obtains x **where** $x \in A$ **and** $Min A = x$
<proof>

lemma *obtains-MIN*:
assumes *finite A and* $A \neq \{\}$
obtains x **where** $x \in A$ **and** $Min (f \text{ ` } A) = f x$
<proof>

1.2 Initial Set up

For convenience and readability, some functions and type synonyms are defined outside locale context

fun *mk-triangle-set* :: $('a \times 'a \times 'a) \Rightarrow 'a \text{ set}$
where *mk-triangle-set* $(x, y, z) = \{x,y,z\}$

type-synonym $'a \text{ edge} = 'a \text{ set}$

type-synonym $'a \text{ pregraph} = ('a \text{ set}) \times ('a \text{ edge set})$

abbreviation *gverts* :: $'a \text{ pregraph} \Rightarrow 'a \text{ set}$ **where**
gverts $H \equiv \text{fst } H$

abbreviation *gedges* :: $'a \text{ pregraph} \Rightarrow 'a \text{ edge set}$ **where**
gedges $H \equiv \text{snd } H$

fun *mk-edge* :: $'a \times 'a \Rightarrow 'a \text{ edge}$ **where**
mk-edge $(u,v) = \{u,v\}$

All edges is simply the set of subsets of a set S of size 2

definition *all-edges* $S \equiv \{e . e \subseteq S \wedge \text{card } e = 2\}$

Note, this is a different definition to Noschinski's [4] ugraph which uses the *mk-edge* function unnecessarily

Basic properties of these functions

lemma *all-edges-mono*:
 $vs \subseteq ws \implies \text{all-edges } vs \subseteq \text{all-edges } ws$
<proof>

lemma *all-edges-alt*: $\text{all-edges } S = \{\{x, y\} \mid x \neq y . x \in S \wedge y \in S \wedge x \neq y\}$

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-alt-pairs*: *all-edges* $S = \text{mk-edge } \{ \{uv \in S \times S. \text{fst } uv \neq \text{snd } uv\} \}$
<proof>

lemma *all-edges-subset-Pow*: *all-edges* $A \subseteq \text{Pow } A$
<proof>

lemma *all-edges-disjoint*: $S \cap T = \{\} \implies \text{all-edges } S \cap \text{all-edges } T = \{\}$
<proof>

lemma *card-all-edges*: *finite* $A \implies \text{card } (\text{all-edges } A) = \text{card } A \text{ choose } 2$
<proof>

lemma *finite-all-edges*: *finite* $S \implies \text{finite } (\text{all-edges } S)$
<proof>

lemma *in-mk-edge-img*: $(a,b) \in A \vee (b,a) \in A \implies \{a,b\} \in \text{mk-edge } A$
<proof>

thm *in-mk-edge-img*

lemma *in-mk-uedge-img-iff*: $\{a,b\} \in \text{mk-edge } A \longleftrightarrow (a,b) \in A \vee (b,a) \in A$
<proof>

lemma *inj-on-mk-edge*: $X \cap Y = \{\} \implies \text{inj-on mk-edge } (X \times Y)$
<proof>

definition *complete-graph* :: 'a set \Rightarrow 'a pregraph **where**
complete-graph $S \equiv (S, \text{all-edges } S)$

definition *all-edges-loops*:: 'a set \Rightarrow 'a edge set**where**
all-edges-loops $S \equiv \text{all-edges } S \cup \{\{v\} \mid v. v \in S\}$

lemma *all-edges-loops-alt*: *all-edges-loops* $S = \{e . e \subseteq S \wedge (\text{card } e = 2 \vee \text{card } e = 1)\}$
<proof>

lemma *loops-disjoint*: *all-edges* $S \cap \{\{v\} \mid v. v \in S\} = \{\}$
<proof>

lemma *all-edges-loops-ss*: *all-edges* $S \subseteq \text{all-edges-loops } S \ \{\{v\} \mid v. v \in S\} \subseteq \text{all-edges-loops } S$
<proof>

lemma *finite-singletons*: *finite* $S \implies \text{finite } (\{\{v\} \mid v. v \in S\})$
<proof>

lemma *card-singletons*:
assumes *finite* S **shows** $\text{card } \{\{v\} \mid v. v \in S\} = \text{card } S$

<proof>

lemma *finite-all-edges-loops*: $finite\ S \implies finite\ (all-edges-loops\ S)$
<proof>

lemma *card-all-edges-loops*:
assumes *finite S*
shows $card\ (all-edges-loops\ S) = (card\ S)\ choose\ 2 + card\ S$
<proof>

1.3 Graph System Locale

A generic incidence set system re-labeled to graph notation, where repeated edges are not allowed. All the definitions here do not need the "edge" size to be constrained to make sense.

locale *graph-system* =
fixes *vertices* :: 'a set (V)
fixes *edges* :: 'a edge set (E)
assumes *wellformed*: $e \in E \implies e \subseteq V$
begin

abbreviation *order* :: nat **where**
order $\equiv card\ (V)$

abbreviation *graph-size* :: nat **where**
graph-size $\equiv card\ E$

definition *incident* :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a edge \Rightarrow bool **where**
incident $v\ e \equiv v \in e$

lemma *incident-edge-in-wf*: $e \in E \implies incident\ v\ e \implies v \in V$
<proof>

definition *incident-edges* :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a edge set **where**
incident-edges $v \equiv \{e . e \in E \wedge incident\ v\ e\}$

lemma *incident-edges-empty*: $\neg (v \in V) \implies incident-edges\ v = \{\}$
<proof>

lemma *finite-incident-edges*: $finite\ E \implies finite\ (incident-edges\ v)$
<proof>

definition *edge-adj* :: 'a edge \Rightarrow 'a edge \Rightarrow bool **where**
edge-adj $e1\ e2 \equiv e1 \cap e2 \neq \{\} \wedge e1 \in E \wedge e2 \in E$

lemma *edge-adj-inE*: $edge-adj\ e1\ e2 \implies e1 \in E \wedge e2 \in E$
<proof>

lemma *edge-adjacent-alt-def*: $e1 \in E \implies e2 \in E \implies \exists x . x \in V \wedge x \in e1 \wedge x \in e2 \implies \text{edge-adj } e1 \ e2$

<proof>

lemma *wellformed-alt-fst*: $\{x, y\} \in E \implies x \in V$

<proof>

lemma *wellformed-alt-snd*: $\{x, y\} \in E \implies y \in V$

<proof>

end

Simple constraints on a graph system may include finite and non-empty constraints

locale *fin-graph-system* = *graph-system* +

assumes *finV*: *finite V*

begin

lemma *fin-edges*: *finite E*

<proof>

end

locale *ne-graph-system* = *graph-system* +

assumes *not-empty*: $V \neq \{\}$

1.4 Undirected Graph with Loops

This formalisation models a loop by a singleton set. In this case a graph has the edge size criteria if it has edges of size 1 or 2. Notably this removes the option for an edge to be empty

locale *ulgraph* = *graph-system* +

assumes *edge-size*: $e \in E \implies \text{card } e > 0 \wedge \text{card } e \leq 2$

begin

lemma *alt-edge-size*: $e \in E \implies \text{card } e = 1 \vee \text{card } e = 2$

<proof>

definition *is-loop*:: 'a *edge* \Rightarrow *bool* **where**

is-loop *e* $\equiv \text{card } e = 1$

definition *is-sedge* :: 'a *edge* \Rightarrow *bool* **where**

is-sedge *e* $\equiv \text{card } e = 2$

lemma *is-edge-or-loop*: $e \in E \implies \text{is-loop } e \vee \text{is-sedge } e$

<proof>

lemma *edges-split-loop*: $E = \{e \in E . \text{is-loop } e\} \cup \{e \in E . \text{is-sedge } e\}$

<proof>

lemma *edges-split-loop-inter-empty*: $\{\} = \{e \in E . \text{is-loop } e\} \cap \{e \in E . \text{is-sedge } e\}$
 ⟨proof⟩

definition *vert-adj* :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ bool **where** — Neighbor in graph from Roth [1]
vert-adj v1 v2 ≡ {v1, v2} ∈ E

lemma *vert-adj-sym*: *vert-adj* v1 v2 ⟷ *vert-adj* v2 v1
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *vert-adj-imp-inV*: *vert-adj* v1 v2 ⟹ v1 ∈ V ∧ v2 ∈ V
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *vert-adj-inc-edge-iff*: *vert-adj* v1 v2 ⟷ *incident* v1 {v1, v2} ∧ *incident* v2 {v1, v2} ∧ {v1, v2} ∈ E
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *not-vert-adj[simp]*: ¬ *vert-adj* v u ⟹ {v, u} ∉ E
 ⟨proof⟩

definition *neighborhood* :: 'a ⇒ 'a set **where** — Neighbors in Roth Development [1]
neighborhood x ≡ {v ∈ V . *vert-adj* x v}

lemma *neighborhood-incident*: u ∈ *neighborhood* v ⟷ {u, v} ∈ *incident-edges* v
 ⟨proof⟩

definition *neighbors-ss* :: 'a ⇒ 'a set ⇒ 'a set **where**
neighbors-ss x Y ≡ {y ∈ Y . *vert-adj* x y}

lemma *vert-adj-edge-iff2*:
assumes v1 ≠ v2
shows *vert-adj* v1 v2 ⟷ (∃ e ∈ E . *incident* v1 e ∧ *incident* v2 e)
 ⟨proof⟩

Incident simple edges, i.e. excluding loops

definition *incident-sedges* :: 'a ⇒ 'a edge set **where**
incident-sedges v ≡ {e ∈ E . *incident* v e ∧ card e = 2}

lemma *finite-inc-sedges*: finite E ⟹ finite (*incident-sedges* v)
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *incident-sedges-empty[simp]*: v ∉ V ⟹ *incident-sedges* v = {}
 ⟨proof⟩

definition *has-loop* :: 'a ⇒ bool **where**
has-loop v ≡ {v} ∈ E

lemma *has-loop-in-verts*: $has-loop\ v \implies v \in V$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-loop-set-alt*: $\{\{v\} \mid v . has-loop\ v\} = \{e \in E . is-loop\ e\}$
 ⟨proof⟩

definition *incident-loops* :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a edge set **where**
incident-loops v $\equiv \{e \in E . e = \{v\}\}$

lemma *card1-incident-imp-vert*: $incident\ v\ e \wedge card\ e = 1 \implies e = \{v\}$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *incident-loops-alt*: $incident-loops\ v = \{e \in E . incident\ v\ e \wedge card\ e = 1\}$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *incident-loops-simp*: $has-loop\ v \implies incident-loops\ v = \{\{v\}\} \neg has-loop\ v$
 $\implies incident-loops\ v = \{\}$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *incident-loops-union*: $\bigcup (incident-loops\ 'V) = \{e \in E . is-loop\ e\}$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *finite-incident-loops*: *finite* (*incident-loops* v)
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *incident-loops-card*: $card\ (incident-loops\ v) \leq 1$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *incident-edges-union*: $incident-edges\ v = incident-sedges\ v \cup incident-loops\ v$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *incident-edges-sedges[simp]*: $\neg has-loop\ v \implies incident-edges\ v = incident-sedges\ v$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *incident-sedges-union*: $\bigcup (incident-sedges\ 'V) = \{e \in E . is-sedge\ e\}$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *empty-not-edge*: $\{\} \notin E$
 ⟨proof⟩

The degree definition is complicated by loops - each loop contributes two to degree. This is required for basic counting properties on the degree to hold

definition *degree* :: 'a \Rightarrow nat **where**
degree v $\equiv card\ (incident-sedges\ v) + 2 * (card\ (incident-loops\ v))$

lemma *degree-no-loops[simp]*: $\neg has-loop\ v \implies degree\ v = card\ (incident-edges\ v)$

<proof>

lemma *degree-none*[simp]: $\neg v \in V \implies \text{degree } v = 0$
<proof>

lemma *degree0-inc-edges-empt-iff*:
assumes *finite E*
shows $\text{degree } v = 0 \iff \text{incident-edges } v = \{\}$
<proof>

lemma *incident-edges-neighbors-img*: $\text{incident-edges } v = (\lambda u. \{v, u\}) \text{ `} (\text{neighborhood } v)$
<proof>

lemma *card-incident-edges-neighborhood*: $\text{card } (\text{incident-edges } v) = \text{card } (\text{neighborhood } v)$
<proof>

lemma *degree0-neighborhood-empt-iff*:
assumes *finite E*
shows $\text{degree } v = 0 \iff \text{neighborhood } v = \{\}$
<proof>

definition *is-isolated-vertex*:: 'a \Rightarrow bool **where**
is-isolated-vertex $v \equiv v \in V \wedge (\forall u \in V. \neg \text{vert-adj } u \ v)$

lemma *is-isolated-vertex-edge*: $\text{is-isolated-vertex } v \implies (\bigwedge e. e \in E \implies \neg (\text{incident } v \ e))$
<proof>

lemma *is-isolated-vertex-no-loop*: $\text{is-isolated-vertex } v \implies \neg \text{has-loop } v$
<proof>

lemma *is-isolated-vertex-degree0*: $\text{is-isolated-vertex } v \implies \text{degree } v = 0$
<proof>

lemma *iso-vertex-empty-neighborhood*: $\text{is-isolated-vertex } v \implies \text{neighborhood } v = \{\}$
<proof>

definition *max-degree* :: nat **where**
max-degree $\equiv \text{Max } \{\text{degree } v \mid v. v \in V\}$

definition *min-degree* :: nat **where**
min-degree $\equiv \text{Min } \{\text{degree } v \mid v. v \in V\}$

definition *is-edge-between* :: 'a set \Rightarrow 'a set \Rightarrow 'a edge \Rightarrow bool **where**
is-edge-between $X \ Y \ e \equiv \exists x \ y. e = \{x, y\} \wedge x \in X \wedge y \in Y$

All edges between two sets of vertices, X and Y , in a graph, G . Inspired

by Szemerédi development [2] and generalised here

definition *all-edges-between* :: 'a set \Rightarrow 'a set \Rightarrow ('a \times 'a) set **where**
all-edges-between X Y \equiv $\{(x, y) . x \in X \wedge y \in Y \wedge \{x, y\} \in E\}$

lemma *all-edges-betw-D3*: $(x, y) \in \text{all-edges-between } X Y \Longrightarrow \{x, y\} \in E$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *all-edges-betw-I*: $x \in X \Longrightarrow y \in Y \Longrightarrow \{x, y\} \in E \Longrightarrow (x, y) \in \text{all-edges-between } X Y$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *all-edges-between-subset*: $\text{all-edges-between } X Y \subseteq X \times Y$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *all-edges-between-E-ss*: *mk-edge* ' $\text{all-edges-between } X Y \subseteq E$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *all-edges-between-rem-wf*: $\text{all-edges-between } X Y = \text{all-edges-between } (X \cap V) (Y \cap V)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *all-edges-between-empty* [simp]:
 $\text{all-edges-between } \{ \} Z = \{ \}$ $\text{all-edges-between } Z \{ \} = \{ \}$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *all-edges-between-disjnt1*: $\text{disjnt } X Y \Longrightarrow \text{disjnt } (\text{all-edges-between } X Z)$
 $(\text{all-edges-between } Y Z)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *all-edges-between-disjnt2*: $\text{disjnt } Y Z \Longrightarrow \text{disjnt } (\text{all-edges-between } X Y)$
 $(\text{all-edges-between } X Z)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *max-all-edges-between*:
assumes *finite X finite Y*
shows $\text{card } (\text{all-edges-between } X Y) \leq \text{card } X * \text{card } Y$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *all-edges-between-Un1*:
 $\text{all-edges-between } (X \cup Y) Z = \text{all-edges-between } X Z \cup \text{all-edges-between } Y Z$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *all-edges-between-Un2*:
 $\text{all-edges-between } X (Y \cup Z) = \text{all-edges-between } X Y \cup \text{all-edges-between } X Z$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *finite-all-edges-between*:
assumes *finite X finite Y*
shows *finite* $(\text{all-edges-between } X Y)$

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-between-Union1:*

all-edges-between (Union \mathcal{X}) $Y = (\bigcup X \in \mathcal{X}. \text{all-edges-between } X Y)$

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-between-Union2:*

all-edges-between X (Union \mathcal{Y}) = ($\bigcup Y \in \mathcal{Y}. \text{all-edges-between } X Y$)

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-between-disjoint1:*

assumes *disjoint R*

shows *disjoint (($\lambda X. \text{all-edges-between } X Y$) ‘ R)*

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-between-disjoint2:*

assumes *disjoint R*

shows *disjoint (($\lambda Y. \text{all-edges-between } X Y$) ‘ R)*

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-between-disjoint-family-on1:*

assumes *disjoint R*

shows *disjoint-family-on ($\lambda X. \text{all-edges-between } X Y$) R*

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-between-disjoint-family-on2:*

assumes *disjoint R*

shows *disjoint-family-on ($\lambda Y. \text{all-edges-between } X Y$) R*

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-between-mono1:*

$Y \subseteq Z \implies \text{all-edges-between } Y X \subseteq \text{all-edges-between } Z X$

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-between-mono2:*

$Y \subseteq Z \implies \text{all-edges-between } X Y \subseteq \text{all-edges-between } X Z$

<proof>

lemma *inj-on-mk-edge: $X \cap Y = \{ \} \implies \text{inj-on mk-edge (all-edges-between } X Y)$*

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-between-subset-times: all-edges-between $X Y \subseteq (X \cap \bigcup E) \times (Y \cap \bigcup E)$*

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-betw-prod-def-neighbors: all-edges-between $X Y = \{ (x, y) \in X \times Y . \text{vert-adj } x y \}$*

<proof>

lemma *all-edges-betw-sigma-neighbor*:
all-edges-between $X Y = (\text{SIGMA } x:X. \text{ neighbors-ss } x Y)$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *card-all-edges-betw-neighbor*:
assumes *finite* X *finite* Y
shows $\text{card } (\text{all-edges-between } X Y) = (\sum x \in X. \text{card } (\text{neighbors-ss } x Y))$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *all-edges-between-swap*:
all-edges-between $X Y = (\lambda(x,y). (y,x)) \cdot (\text{all-edges-between } Y X)$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *card-all-edges-between-commute*:
 $\text{card } (\text{all-edges-between } X Y) = \text{card } (\text{all-edges-between } Y X)$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *all-edges-between-set*: $\text{mk-edge } \cdot \text{all-edges-between } X Y = \{\{x, y\} \mid x y. x \in X \wedge y \in Y \wedge \{x, y\} \in E\}$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

1.5 Edge Density

The edge density between two sets of vertices, X and Y , in G . This is the same definition as taken in the Szemerédi development, generalised here [2]

definition *edge-density* $X Y \equiv \text{card } (\text{all-edges-between } X Y) / (\text{card } X * \text{card } Y)$

lemma *edge-density-ge0*: $\text{edge-density } X Y \geq 0$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *edge-density-le1*: $\text{edge-density } X Y \leq 1$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *edge-density-zero*: $Y = \{\} \implies \text{edge-density } X Y = 0$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *edge-density-commute*: $\text{edge-density } X Y = \text{edge-density } Y X$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *edge-density-Un*:
assumes *disjnt* $X1 X2$ *finite* $X1$ *finite* $X2$ *finite* Y
shows $\text{edge-density } (X1 \cup X2) Y = (\text{edge-density } X1 Y * \text{card } X1 + \text{edge-density } X2 Y * \text{card } X2) / (\text{card } X1 + \text{card } X2)$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *edge-density-eq0*:
assumes $\text{all-edges-between } A B = \{\}$ **and** $X \subseteq A$ $Y \subseteq B$
shows $\text{edge-density } X Y = 0$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end

A number of lemmas are limited to a finite graph

locale *fin-ulgraph* = *ulgraph* + *fin-graph-system*
begin

lemma *card-is-has-loop-eq*: $\text{card } \{e \in E . \text{is-loop } e\} = \text{card } \{v \in V . \text{has-loop } v\}$
(*proof*)

lemma *finite-all-edges-between'*: $\text{finite } (\text{all-edges-between } X Y)$
(*proof*)

lemma *card-all-edges-between*:

assumes *finite* Y

shows $\text{card } (\text{all-edges-between } X Y) = (\sum y \in Y. \text{card } (\text{all-edges-between } X \{y\}))$
(*proof*)

end

1.6 Simple Graphs

A simple graph (or *sgraph*) constrains edges to size of two. This is the classic definition of an undirected graph

locale *sgraph* = *graph-system* +
assumes *two-edges*: $e \in E \implies \text{card } e = 2$
begin

lemma *wellformed-all-edges*: $E \subseteq \text{all-edges } V$
(*proof*)

lemma *e-in-all-edges*: $e \in E \implies e \in \text{all-edges } V$
(*proof*)

lemma *e-in-all-edges-ss*: $e \in E \implies e \subseteq V' \implies V' \subseteq V \implies e \in \text{all-edges } V'$
(*proof*)

lemma *singleton-not-edge*: $\{x\} \notin E$ — Suggested by Mantas Baksys
(*proof*)

end

It is easy to proof that *sgraph* is a sublocale of *ulgraph*. By using indirect inheritance, we avoid two unneeded cardinality conditions

sublocale *sgraph* \subseteq *ulgraph* $V E$
(*proof*)

locale *fin-sgraph* = *sgraph* + *fin-graph-system*
begin

lemma *fin-neighbourhood: finite (neighborhood x)*
<proof>

lemma *fin-all-edges: finite (all-edges V)*
<proof>

lemma *max-edges-graph: card E ≤ (card V) ^ 2*
<proof>

end

sublocale *fin-sgraph ⊆ fin-ulgraph*
<proof>

context *sgraph*
begin

lemma *no-loops: v ∈ V ⇒ ¬ has-loop v*
<proof>

Ideally, we'd redefine degree in the context of a simple graph. However, this requires a named loop locale, which complicates notation unnecessarily. This is the lemma that should always be used when unfolding the degree definition in a simple graph context

lemma *alt-degree-def[simp]: degree v = card (incident-edges v)*
<proof>

lemma *alt-deg-neighborhood: degree v = card (neighborhood v)*
<proof>

definition *degree-set :: 'a set ⇒ nat where*
degree-set vs ≡ card {e ∈ E. vs ⊆ e}

definition *is-complete-n-graph:: nat ⇒ bool where*
is-complete-n-graph n ≡ order = n ∧ E = all-edges V

The complement of a graph is a basic concept

definition *is-complement :: 'a pregraph ⇒ bool where*
is-complement G ≡ V = gverts G ∧ gedges G = all-edges V - E

definition *complement-edges :: 'a edge set where*
complement-edges ≡ all-edges V - E

lemma *is-complement-edges: is-complement (V', E') ⟷ V = V' ∧ comple-*
ment-edges = E'
<proof>

interpretation *G-comp: sgraph V complement-edges*
<proof>

lemma *is-complement-edge-iff*: $e \subseteq V \implies e \in \text{complement-edges} \iff e \notin E \wedge \text{card } e = 2$
 ⟨proof⟩

end

A complete graph is a simple graph

lemma *complete-sgraph*: *sgraph* S (*all-edges* S)
 ⟨proof⟩

interpretation *comp-sgraph*: *sgraph* S (*all-edges* S)
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *complete-fin-sgraph*: *finite* $S \implies \text{fin-sgraph}$ S (*all-edges* S)
 ⟨proof⟩

1.7 Subgraph Basics

A subgraph is defined as a graph where the vertex and edge sets are subsets of the original graph. Note that using the locale approach, we require each graph to be wellformed. This is interestingly omitted in a number of other formal definitions.

locale *subgraph* = H : *graph-system* V_H :: 'a set E_H + G : *graph-system* V_G :: 'a set E_G **for** V_H E_H V_G E_G +
assumes *verts-ss*: $V_H \subseteq V_G$
assumes *edges-ss*: $E_H \subseteq E_G$

lemma *is-subgraphI[intro]*: $V' \subseteq V \implies E' \subseteq E \implies \text{graph-system}$ V' $E' \implies \text{graph-system}$ V $E \implies \text{subgraph}$ V' E' V E
 ⟨proof⟩

context *subgraph*
begin

Note: it could also be useful to have similar rules in *ulgraph* locale etc with subgraph assumption

lemma *is-subgraph-ulgraph*:
assumes *ulgraph* V_G E_G
shows *ulgraph* V_H E_H
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-simp-subgraph*:
assumes *sgraph* V_G E_G
shows *sgraph* V_H E_H
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-finite-subgraph*:

assumes *fin-graph-system* $V_G E_G$

shows *fin-graph-system* $V_H E_H$

<proof>

lemma (**in** *graph-system*) *subgraph-refl*: *subgraph* $V E V E$

<proof>

lemma *subgraph-trans*:

assumes *graph-system* $V E$

assumes *graph-system* $V' E'$

assumes *graph-system* $V'' E''$

shows *subgraph* $V'' E'' V' E' \implies \text{subgraph } V' E' V E \implies \text{subgraph } V'' E'' V E$

<proof>

lemma *subgraph-antisym*: *subgraph* $V' E' V E \implies \text{subgraph } V E V' E' \implies V = V' \wedge E = E'$

<proof>

end

lemma (**in** *sgraph*) *subgraph-complete*: *subgraph* $V E V$ (*all-edges* V)

<proof>

We are often interested in the set of subgraphs. This is still very possible using locale definitions. Interesting Note - random graphs [3] has a different definition for the well formed constraint to be added in here instead of in the main subgraph definition

definition (**in** *graph-system*) *subgraphs*:: 'a pregraph set **where**

subgraphs $\equiv \{G . \text{subgraph } (\text{guverts } G) (\text{gedges } G) V E\}$

Induced subgraph - really only affects edges

definition (**in** *graph-system*) *induced-edges*:: 'a set \Rightarrow 'a edge set **where**

induced-edges $V' \equiv \{e \in E. e \subseteq V'\}$

lemma (**in** *sgraph*) *induced-edges-alt*: *induced-edges* $V' = E \cap \text{all-edges } V'$

<proof>

lemma (**in** *sgraph*) *induced-edges-self*: *induced-edges* $V = E$

<proof>

context *graph-system*

begin

lemma *induced-edges-ss*: $V' \subseteq V \implies \text{induced-edges } V' \subseteq E$

<proof>

lemma *induced-is-graph-sys*: $\text{graph-system } V' \text{ (induced-edges } V')$
 ⟨proof⟩

interpretation *induced-graph*: $\text{graph-system } V' \text{ (induced-edges } V')$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *induced-is-subgraph*: $V' \subseteq V \implies \text{subgraph } V' \text{ (induced-edges } V') V E$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *induced-edges-union*:
 assumes $VH1 \subseteq S \text{ } VH2 \subseteq T$
 assumes $\text{graph-system } VH1 \text{ } EH1 \text{ graph-system } VH2 \text{ } EH2$
 assumes $EH1 \cup EH2 \subseteq (\text{induced-edges } (S \cup T))$
 shows $EH1 \subseteq (\text{induced-edges } S)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *induced-edges-union-subgraph-single*:
 assumes $VH1 \subseteq S \text{ } VH2 \subseteq T$
 assumes $\text{graph-system } VH1 \text{ } EH1 \text{ graph-system } VH2 \text{ } EH2$
 assumes $\text{subgraph } (VH1 \cup VH2) \text{ } (EH1 \cup EH2) \text{ } (S \cup T) \text{ (induced-edges } (S \cup T))$
 shows $\text{subgraph } VH1 \text{ } EH1 \text{ } S \text{ (induced-edges } S)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *induced-union-subgraph*:
 assumes $VH1 \subseteq S \text{ and } VH2 \subseteq T$
 assumes $\text{graph-system } VH1 \text{ } EH1 \text{ graph-system } VH2 \text{ } EH2$
 shows $\text{subgraph } VH1 \text{ } EH1 \text{ } S \text{ (induced-edges } S) \wedge \text{subgraph } VH2 \text{ } EH2 \text{ } T \text{ (induced-edges } T) \longleftrightarrow$
 $\text{subgraph } (VH1 \cup VH2) \text{ } (EH1 \cup EH2) \text{ } (S \cup T) \text{ (induced-edges } (S \cup T))$
 ⟨proof⟩

end

end

theory *Undirected-Graph-Walks* **imports** *Undirected-Graph-Basics*
begin

2 Walks, Paths and Cycles

The definition of walks, paths, cycles, and related concepts are foundations of graph theory, yet there can be some differences in literature between definitions. This formalisation draws inspiration from Noschinski's Graph Library [5], however focuses on an undirected graph context compared to a directed graph context, and extends on some definitions, as required to formalise Balog Szemerédi Gowers theorem.

context *ulgraph*
begin

2.1 Walks

This definition is taken from the directed graph library, however edges are undirected

fun *walk-edges* :: 'a list \Rightarrow 'a edge list **where**

walk-edges [] = []
| *walk-edges* [x] = []
| *walk-edges* (x # y # ys) = {x,y} # *walk-edges* (y # ys)

lemma *walk-edges-app*: *walk-edges* (xs @ [y, x]) = *walk-edges* (xs @ [y]) @ [{y, x}]
⟨proof⟩

lemma *walk-edges-tl-ss*: set (*walk-edges* (tl xs)) \subseteq set (*walk-edges* xs)
⟨proof⟩

lemma *walk-edges-rev*: rev (*walk-edges* xs) = *walk-edges* (rev xs)
⟨proof⟩

lemma *walk-edges-append-ss1*: set (*walk-edges* (ys)) \subseteq set (*walk-edges* (xs@ys))
⟨proof⟩

lemma *walk-edges-append-ss2*: set (*walk-edges* (xs)) \subseteq set (*walk-edges* (xs@ys))
⟨proof⟩

lemma *walk-edges-singleton-app*: ys \neq [] \implies *walk-edges* ([x]@ys) = {x, hd ys} # *walk-edges* ys
⟨proof⟩

lemma *walk-edges-append-union*: xs \neq [] \implies ys \neq [] \implies
set (*walk-edges* (xs@ys)) = set (*walk-edges* (xs)) \cup set (*walk-edges* (ys)) \cup {{last xs, hd ys}}
⟨proof⟩

lemma *walk-edges-decomp-ss*: set (*walk-edges* (xs@[y]@zs)) \subseteq set (*walk-edges* (xs@[y]@ys@[y]@zs))
⟨proof⟩

definition *walk-length* :: 'a list \Rightarrow nat **where**
walk-length p \equiv length (*walk-edges* p)

lemma *walk-length-conv*: *walk-length* p = length p - 1
⟨proof⟩

lemma *walk-length-rev*: *walk-length* p = *walk-length* (rev p)
⟨proof⟩

lemma *walk-length-app*: xs \neq [] \implies ys \neq [] \implies *walk-length* (xs @ ys) = *walk-length* xs + *walk-length* ys + 1
⟨proof⟩

lemma *walk-length-app-ineq*: $walk-length (xs @ ys) \geq walk-length xs + walk-length ys \wedge$
 $walk-length (xs @ ys) \leq walk-length xs + walk-length ys + 1$
 ⟨proof⟩

Note that while the trivial walk is allowed, the empty walk is not

definition *is-walk* :: 'a list \Rightarrow bool **where**
is-walk $xs \equiv set\ xs \subseteq V \wedge set\ (walk-edges\ xs) \subseteq E \wedge xs \neq []$

lemma *is-walkI*: $set\ xs \subseteq V \Longrightarrow set\ (walk-edges\ xs) \subseteq E \Longrightarrow xs \neq [] \Longrightarrow is-walk\ xs$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-walk-wf*: $is-walk\ xs \Longrightarrow set\ xs \subseteq V$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-walk-wf-hd*: $is-walk\ xs \Longrightarrow hd\ xs \in V$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-walk-wf-last*: $is-walk\ xs \Longrightarrow last\ xs \in V$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-walk-singleton*: $u \in V \Longrightarrow is-walk\ [u]$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-walk-not-empty*: $is-walk\ xs \Longrightarrow xs \neq []$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-walk-not-empty2*: $is-walk\ [] = False$
 ⟨proof⟩

Reasoning on transformations of a walk

lemma *is-walk-rev*: $is-walk\ xs \longleftrightarrow is-walk\ (rev\ xs)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-walk-tl*: $length\ xs \geq 2 \Longrightarrow is-walk\ xs \Longrightarrow is-walk\ (tl\ xs)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-walk-append*:
assumes *is-walk* xs
assumes *is-walk* ys
assumes $last\ xs = hd\ ys$
shows *is-walk* $(xs @ (tl\ ys))$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-walk-decomp*:
assumes *is-walk* $(xs @ [y] @ ys @ [y] @ zs)$ (**is** *is-walk* $?w$)
shows *is-walk* $(xs @ [y] @ zs)$

<proof>

lemma *is-walk-hd-tl*:

assumes *is-walk* (*y* # *ys*)

assumes $\{x, y\} \in E$

shows *is-walk* (*x* # *y* # *ys*)

<proof>

lemma *is-walk-drop-hd*:

assumes *ys* $\neq []$

assumes *is-walk* (*y* # *ys*)

shows *is-walk* *ys*

<proof>

lemma *walk-edges-index*:

assumes $i \geq 0$ $i < \text{walk-length } w$

assumes *is-walk* *w*

shows $(\text{walk-edges } w) ! i \in E$

<proof>

lemma *is-walk-index*:

assumes $i \geq 0$ $\text{Suc } i < (\text{length } w)$

assumes *is-walk* *w*

shows $\{w ! i, w ! (i + 1)\} \in E$

<proof>

lemma *is-walk-take*:

assumes *is-walk* *w*

assumes $n > 0$

assumes $n \leq \text{length } w$

shows *is-walk* (*take* *n* *w*)

<proof>

lemma *is-walk-drop*:

assumes *is-walk* *w*

assumes $n < \text{length } w$

shows *is-walk* (*drop* *n* *w*)

<proof>

definition *walks* :: 'a list set **where**

walks $\equiv \{p. \text{is-walk } p\}$

definition *is-open-walk* :: 'a list \Rightarrow bool **where**

is-open-walk *xs* $\equiv \text{is-walk } xs \wedge \text{hd } xs \neq \text{last } xs$

lemma *is-open-walk-rev*: *is-open-walk* *xs* \longleftrightarrow *is-open-walk* (*rev* *xs*)

<proof>

definition *is-closed-walk* :: 'a list \Rightarrow bool **where**

$is-closed-walk\ xs \equiv is-walk\ xs \wedge hd\ xs = last\ xs$

lemma *is-closed-walk-rev*: $is-closed-walk\ xs \longleftrightarrow is-closed-walk\ (rev\ xs)$
 ⟨proof⟩

definition *is-trail* :: 'a list \Rightarrow bool **where**
 $is-trail\ xs \equiv is-walk\ xs \wedge distinct\ (walk-edges\ xs)$

lemma *is-trail-rev*: $is-trail\ xs \longleftrightarrow is-trail\ (rev\ xs)$
 ⟨proof⟩

2.2 Paths

There are two common definitions of a path. The first, given below, excludes the case where a path is a cycle. Note this also excludes the trivial path $[x]$

definition *is-path* :: 'a list \Rightarrow bool **where**
 $is-path\ xs \equiv (is-open-walk\ xs \wedge distinct\ (xs))$

lemma *is-path-rev*: $is-path\ xs \longleftrightarrow is-path\ (rev\ xs)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-path-walk*: $is-path\ xs \Longrightarrow is-walk\ xs$
 ⟨proof⟩

definition *paths* :: 'a list set **where**
 $paths \equiv \{p \mid is-path\ p\}$

lemma *paths-ss-walk*: $paths \subseteq walks$
 ⟨proof⟩

A more generic definition of a path - used when a cycle is considered a path, and therefore includes the trivial path $[x]$

definition *is-gen-path*:: 'a list \Rightarrow bool **where**
 $is-gen-path\ p \equiv is-walk\ p \wedge ((distinct\ (tl\ p) \wedge hd\ p = last\ p) \vee distinct\ p)$

lemma *is-path-gen-path*: $is-path\ p \Longrightarrow is-gen-path\ p$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-gen-path-rev*: $is-gen-path\ p \longleftrightarrow is-gen-path\ (rev\ p)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-gen-path-distinct*: $is-gen-path\ p \Longrightarrow hd\ p \neq last\ p \Longrightarrow distinct\ p$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-gen-path-distinct-tl*:
assumes $is-gen-path\ p$ **and** $hd\ p = last\ p$
shows $distinct\ (tl\ p)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-gen-path-trivial*: $x \in V \implies \text{is-gen-path } [x]$
 ⟨proof⟩

definition *gen-paths* :: 'a list set **where**
gen-paths $\equiv \{p . \text{is-gen-path } p\}$

lemma *gen-paths-ss-walks*: $\text{gen-paths} \subseteq \text{walks}$
 ⟨proof⟩

2.3 Cycles

Note, a cycle must be non trivial (i.e. have an edge), but as we let a loop by a cycle we broaden the definition in comparison to Noschinski [5] for a cycle to be of length greater than 1 rather than 3

definition *is-cycle* :: 'a list \Rightarrow bool **where**
is-cycle $xs \equiv \text{is-closed-walk } xs \wedge \text{walk-length } xs \geq 1 \wedge \text{distinct } (\text{tl } xs)$

lemma *is-gen-path-cycle*: $\text{is-cycle } p \implies \text{is-gen-path } p$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-cycle-alt-gen-path*: $\text{is-cycle } xs \longleftrightarrow \text{is-gen-path } xs \wedge \text{walk-length } xs \geq 1 \wedge \text{hd } xs = \text{last } xs$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-cycle-alt*: $\text{is-cycle } xs \longleftrightarrow \text{is-walk } xs \wedge \text{distinct } (\text{tl } xs) \wedge \text{walk-length } xs \geq 1 \wedge \text{hd } xs = \text{last } xs$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-cycle-rev*: $\text{is-cycle } xs \longleftrightarrow \text{is-cycle } (\text{rev } xs)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *cycle-tl-is-path*: $\text{is-cycle } xs \wedge \text{walk-length } xs \geq 3 \implies \text{is-path } (\text{tl } xs)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-gen-path-path*:
assumes *is-gen-path* p **and** $\text{walk-length } p > 0$ **and** $(\neg \text{is-cycle } p)$
shows *is-path* p
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-gen-path-options*: $\text{is-gen-path } p \longleftrightarrow \text{is-cycle } p \vee \text{is-path } p \vee (\exists v \in V. p = [v])$
 ⟨proof⟩

definition *cycles* :: 'a list set **where**
cycles $\equiv \{p. \text{is-cycle } p\}$

lemma *cycles-ss-gen-paths*: $\text{cycles} \subseteq \text{gen-paths}$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *gen-paths-ss*: $gen\text{-}paths \subseteq cycles \cup paths \cup \{[v] \mid v. v \in V\}$
(*proof*)

Walk edges are distinct in a path and cycle

lemma *distinct-edgesI*:
assumes *distinct p* **shows** *distinct (walk-edges p)*
(*proof*)

lemma *scycles-distinct-edges*:
assumes $c \in cycles$ $3 \leq walk\text{-}length\ c$ **shows** *distinct (walk-edges c)*
(*proof*)

end

context *fin-ulgraph*
begin

lemma *finite-paths*: *finite paths*
(*proof*)

lemma *finite-cycles*: *finite (cycles)*
(*proof*)

lemma *finite-gen-paths*: *finite (gen-paths)*
(*proof*)

end

end

3 Connectivity

This theory defines concepts around the connectivity of a graph and its vertices, as well as graph properties that depend on connectivity definitions, such as shortest path, radius, diameter, and eccentricity

theory *Connectivity* **imports** *Undirected-Graph-Walks*
begin

context *ulgraph*
begin

3.1 Connecting Walks and Paths

definition *connecting-walk* :: $'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'a\ list \Rightarrow bool$ **where**
 $connecting\text{-}walk\ u\ v\ xs \equiv is\text{-}walk\ xs \wedge hd\ xs = u \wedge last\ xs = v$

lemma *connecting-walk-rev*: $connecting\text{-}walk\ u\ v\ xs \longleftrightarrow connecting\text{-}walk\ v\ u\ (rev\ xs)$

<proof>

lemma *connecting-walk-wf*: $connecting-walk\ u\ v\ xs \implies u \in V \wedge v \in V$
<proof>

lemma *connecting-walk-self*: $u \in V \implies connecting-walk\ u\ u\ [u] = True$
<proof>

We define two definitions of connecting paths. The first uses the *gen-path* definition, which allows for trivial paths and cycles, the second uses the stricter definition of a path which requires it to be an open walk

definition *connecting-path* :: $'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'a\ list \Rightarrow bool$ **where**
 $connecting-path\ u\ v\ xs \equiv is-gen-path\ xs \wedge hd\ xs = u \wedge last\ xs = v$

definition *connecting-path-str* :: $'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'a\ list \Rightarrow bool$ **where**
 $connecting-path-str\ u\ v\ xs \equiv is-path\ xs \wedge hd\ xs = u \wedge last\ xs = v$

lemma *connecting-path-rev*: $connecting-path\ u\ v\ xs \longleftrightarrow connecting-path\ v\ u\ (rev\ xs)$
<proof>

lemma *connecting-path-walk*: $connecting-path\ u\ v\ xs \implies connecting-walk\ u\ v\ xs$
<proof>

lemma *connecting-path-str-gen*: $connecting-path-str\ u\ v\ xs \implies connecting-path\ u\ v\ xs$
<proof>

lemma *connecting-path-gen-str*: $connecting-path\ u\ v\ xs \implies (\neg is-cycle\ xs) \implies walk-length\ xs > 0 \implies connecting-path-str\ u\ v\ xs$
<proof>

lemma *connecting-path-alt-def*: $connecting-path\ u\ v\ xs \longleftrightarrow connecting-walk\ u\ v\ xs \wedge is-gen-path\ xs$
<proof>

lemma *connecting-path-length-bound*: $u \neq v \implies connecting-path\ u\ v\ p \implies walk-length\ p \geq 1$
<proof>

lemma *connecting-path-self*: $u \in V \implies connecting-path\ u\ u\ [u] = True$
<proof>

lemma *connecting-path-singleton*: $connecting-path\ u\ v\ xs \implies length\ xs = 1 \implies u = v$
<proof>

lemma *connecting-walk-path*:
assumes $connecting-walk\ u\ v\ xs$

shows $\exists ys . \text{connecting-path } u \ v \ ys \wedge \text{walk-length } ys \leq \text{walk-length } xs$
(proof)

lemma *connecting-walk-split*:

assumes *connecting-walk* $u \ v \ xs$ **assumes** *connecting-walk* $v \ z \ ys$
shows *connecting-walk* $u \ z \ (xs \ @ \ (tl \ ys))$
(proof)

lemma *connecting-path-split*:

assumes *connecting-path* $u \ v \ xs$ *connecting-path* $v \ z \ ys$
obtains p **where** *connecting-path* $u \ z \ p$ **and** $\text{walk-length } p \leq \text{walk-length } (xs \ @ \ (tl \ ys))$
(proof)

lemma *connecting-path-split-length*:

assumes *connecting-path* $u \ v \ xs$ *connecting-path* $v \ z \ ys$
obtains p **where** *connecting-path* $u \ z \ p$ **and** $\text{walk-length } p \leq \text{walk-length } xs + \text{walk-length } ys$
(proof)

3.2 Vertex Connectivity

Two vertices are defined to be connected if there exists a connecting path. Note that the more general version of a connecting path is again used as a vertex should be considered as connected to itself

definition *vert-connected* :: $'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ **where**
 $\text{vert-connected } u \ v \equiv \exists xs . \text{connecting-path } u \ v \ xs$

lemma *vert-connected-rev*: $\text{vert-connected } u \ v \longleftrightarrow \text{vert-connected } v \ u$
(proof)

lemma *vert-connected-id*: $u \in V \Longrightarrow \text{vert-connected } u \ u = \text{True}$
(proof)

lemma *vert-connected-trans*: $\text{vert-connected } u \ v \Longrightarrow \text{vert-connected } v \ z \Longrightarrow \text{vert-connected } u \ z$
(proof)

lemma *vert-connected-wf*: $\text{vert-connected } u \ v \Longrightarrow u \in V \wedge v \in V$
(proof)

definition *vert-connected-n* :: $'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow \text{nat} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ **where**
 $\text{vert-connected-n } u \ v \ n \equiv \exists p . \text{connecting-path } u \ v \ p \wedge \text{walk-length } p = n$

lemma *vert-connected-n-imp*: $\text{vert-connected-n } u \ v \ n \Longrightarrow \text{vert-connected } u \ v$
(proof)

lemma *vert-connected-n-rev*: $\text{vert-connected-n } u \ v \ n \longleftrightarrow \text{vert-connected-n } v \ u \ n$
(proof)

definition *connecting-paths* :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'a list set **where**
connecting-paths u v ≡ {xs . *connecting-path* u v xs}

lemma *connecting-paths-self*: u ∈ V ⇒ [u] ∈ *connecting-paths* u u
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *connecting-paths-empty-iff*: *vert-connected* u v ⇔ *connecting-paths* u v ≠ {}
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *elem-connecting-paths*: p ∈ *connecting-paths* u v ⇒ *connecting-path* u v p
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *connecting-paths-ss-gen*: *connecting-paths* u v ⊆ *gen-paths*
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *connecting-paths-sym*: xs ∈ *connecting-paths* u v ⇔ rev xs ∈ *connecting-paths* v u
 ⟨proof⟩

A set is considered to be connected, if all the vertices within that set are pairwise connected

definition *is-connected-set* :: 'a set ⇒ bool **where**
is-connected-set V' ≡ (∀ u v . u ∈ V' ⇒ v ∈ V' ⇒ *vert-connected* u v)

lemma *is-connected-set-empty*: *is-connected-set* {}
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-connected-set-singleton*: x ∈ V ⇒ *is-connected-set* {x}
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-connected-set-wf*: *is-connected-set* V' ⇒ V' ⊆ V
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *is-connected-setD*: *is-connected-set* V' ⇒ u ∈ V' ⇒ v ∈ V' ⇒ *vert-connected* u v
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *not-connected-set*: ¬ *is-connected-set* V' ⇒ u ∈ V' ⇒ ∃ v ∈ V' . ¬ *vert-connected* u v
 ⟨proof⟩

3.3 Graph Properties on Connectivity

The shortest path is defined to be the infimum of the set of connecting path walk lengths. Drawing inspiration from [4], we use the infimum and enats as this enables more natural reasoning in a non-finite setting, while also being useful for proofs of a more probabilistic or analysis nature

definition *shortest-path* :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ enat **where**
shortest-path u v ≡ INF p ∈ *connecting-paths* u v. enat (walk-length p)

lemma *shortest-path-walk-length*: *shortest-path* u v = n ⇒ p ∈ *connecting-paths* u v ⇒ walk-length p ≥ n
<proof>

lemma *shortest-path-lte*: $\bigwedge p . p \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v \implies \text{shortest-path } u \ v \leq \text{walk-length } p$
<proof>

lemma *shortest-path-obtains*:
assumes *shortest-path* u v = n
assumes n ≠ top
obtains p **where** p ∈ *connecting-paths* u v **and** walk-length p = n
<proof>

lemma *shortest-path-intro*:
assumes n ≠ top
assumes (∃ p ∈ *connecting-paths* u v . walk-length p = n)
assumes ($\bigwedge p . p \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v \implies n \leq \text{walk-length } p$)
shows *shortest-path* u v = n
<proof>

lemma *shortest-path-self*:
assumes u ∈ V
shows *shortest-path* u u = 0
<proof>

lemma *connecting-paths-sym-length*: i ∈ *connecting-paths* u v ⇒ ∃ j ∈ *connecting-paths* v u. (walk-length j) = (walk-length i)
<proof>

lemma *shortest-path-sym*: *shortest-path* u v = *shortest-path* v u
<proof>

lemma *shortest-path-inf*: ¬ vert-connected u v ⇒ *shortest-path* u v = ∞
<proof>

lemma *shortest-path-not-inf*:
assumes vert-connected u v
shows *shortest-path* u v ≠ ∞
<proof>

lemma *shortest-path-obtains2*:
assumes vert-connected u v
obtains p **where** p ∈ *connecting-paths* u v **and** walk-length p = *shortest-path* u v
<proof>

lemma *shortest-path-split*: $\text{shortest-path } x \ y \leq \text{shortest-path } x \ z + \text{shortest-path } z \ y$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *shortest-path-invalid-v*: $v \notin V \vee u \notin V \implies \text{shortest-path } u \ v = \infty$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *shortest-path-lb*:
assumes $u \neq v$
assumes *vert-connected* $u \ v$
shows $\text{shortest-path } u \ v > 0$
 ⟨proof⟩

Eccentricity of a vertex v is the furthest distance between it and a (different) vertex

definition *eccentricity* :: 'a \Rightarrow enat **where**
eccentricity $v \equiv \text{SUP } u \in V - \{v\}. \text{shortest-path } v \ u$

lemma *eccentricity-empty-vertices*: $V = \{\} \implies \text{eccentricity } v = 0$
 $V = \{v\} \implies \text{eccentricity } v = 0$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *eccentricity-bot-iff*: $\text{eccentricity } v = 0 \iff V = \{\} \vee V = \{v\}$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *eccentricity-invalid-v*:
assumes $v \notin V$
assumes $V \neq \{\}$
shows $\text{eccentricity } v = \infty$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *eccentricity-gt-shortest-path*:
assumes $u \in V$
shows $\text{eccentricity } v \geq \text{shortest-path } v \ u$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *eccentricity-disconnected-graph*:
assumes $\neg \text{is-connected-set } V$
assumes $v \in V$
shows $\text{eccentricity } v = \infty$
 ⟨proof⟩

The diameter is the largest distance between any two vertices

definition *diameter* :: enat **where**
diameter $\equiv \text{SUP } v \in V . \text{eccentricity } v$

lemma *diameter-gt-eccentricity*: $v \in V \implies \text{diameter} \geq \text{eccentricity } v$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *diameter-disconnected-graph*:

assumes \neg *is-connected-set* V

shows $diameter = \infty$

<proof>

lemma *diameter-empty*: $V = \{\}$ $\implies diameter = 0$

<proof>

lemma *diameter-singleton*: $V = \{v\}$ $\implies diameter = eccentricity\ v$

<proof>

The radius is the smallest "shortest" distance between any two vertices

definition *radius* :: *enat* **where**

$radius \equiv INF\ v \in V . eccentricity\ v$

lemma *radius-lt-eccentricity*: $v \in V \implies radius \leq eccentricity\ v$

<proof>

lemma *radius-disconnected-graph*: \neg *is-connected-set* $V \implies radius = \infty$

<proof>

lemma *radius-empty*: $V = \{\}$ $\implies radius = \infty$

<proof>

lemma *radius-singleton*: $V = \{v\} \implies radius = eccentricity\ v$

<proof>

The centre of the graph is all vertices whose eccentricity equals the radius

definition *centre* :: *'a set* **where**

$centre \equiv \{v \in V . eccentricity\ v = radius\}$

lemma *centre-disconnected-graph*: \neg *is-connected-set* $V \implies centre = V$

<proof>

end

lemma (**in** *fin-ulgraph*) *fin-connecting-paths*: *finite* (*connecting-paths* $u\ v$)

<proof>

3.4 We define a connected graph as a non-empty graph (the empty set is not usually considered connected by convention), where the vertex set is connected

locale *connected-ulgraph* = *ulgraph* + *ne-graph-system* +

assumes *connected*: *is-connected-set* V

begin

lemma *vertices-connected*: $u \in V \implies v \in V \implies vert-connected\ u\ v$

<proof>

lemma *vertices-connected-path*: $u \in V \implies v \in V \implies \exists p. \text{connecting-path } u \ v \ p$
<proof>

lemma *connecting-paths-not-empty*: $u \in V \implies v \in V \implies \text{connecting-paths } u \ v \neq \{\}$
<proof>

lemma *min-shortest-path*: **assumes** $u \in V \ v \in V \ u \neq v$
shows $\text{shortest-path } u \ v > 0$
<proof>

The eccentricity, diameter, radius, and centre definitions tend to be only used in a connected context, as otherwise they are the INF/SUP value. In these contexts, we can obtain the vertex responsible

lemma *eccentricity-obtains-inf*:
assumes $V \neq \{v\}$
shows $\text{eccentricity } v = \infty \vee (\exists u \in (V - \{v\}). \text{shortest-path } v \ u = \text{eccentricity } v)$
<proof>

lemma *diameter-obtains*: $\text{diameter} = \infty \vee (\exists v \in V. \text{eccentricity } v = \text{diameter})$
<proof>

lemma *radius-diameter-singleton-eq*: **assumes** $\text{card } V = 1$ **shows** $\text{radius} = \text{diameter}$
<proof>

end

locale *fin-connected-ulgraph* = *connected-ulgraph* + *fin-ulgraph*
begin

In a finite context the supremum/infimum are equivalent to the Max/Min of the sets respectively. This can make reasoning easier

lemma *shortest-path-Min-alt*:
assumes $u \in V \ v \in V$
shows $\text{shortest-path } u \ v = \text{Min } ((\lambda p. \text{enat } (\text{walk-length } p)) \text{ ` } (\text{connecting-paths } u \ v))$ (**is** $\text{shortest-path } u \ v = \text{Min } ?A$)
<proof>

lemma *eccentricity-Max-alt*:
assumes $v \in V$
assumes $V \neq \{v\}$
shows $\text{eccentricity } v = \text{Max } ((\lambda u. \text{shortest-path } v \ u) \text{ ` } (V - \{v\}))$
<proof>

lemma *diameter-Max-alt*: $\text{diameter} = \text{Max } ((\lambda v. \text{eccentricity } v) \text{ ` } V)$

<proof>

lemma *radius-Min-alt*: $radius = \text{Min} ((\lambda v. \text{eccentricity } v) \text{ ` } V)$

<proof>

lemma *eccentricity-obtains*:

assumes $v \in V$

assumes $V \neq \{v\}$

obtains u **where** $u \in V$ **and** $u \neq v$ **and** $\text{shortest-path } u \ v = \text{eccentricity } v$

<proof>

lemma *radius-obtains*:

obtains v **where** $v \in V$ **and** $radius = \text{eccentricity } v$

<proof>

lemma *radius-obtains-path-vertices*:

assumes $\text{card } V \geq 2$

obtains $u \ v$ **where** $u \in V$ **and** $v \in V$ **and** $u \neq v$ **and** $radius = \text{shortest-path } u \ v$

<proof>

lemma *diameter-obtains*:

obtains v **where** $v \in V$ **and** $diameter = \text{eccentricity } v$

<proof>

lemma *diameter-obtains-path-vertices*:

assumes $\text{card } V \geq 2$

obtains $u \ v$ **where** $u \in V$ **and** $v \in V$ **and** $u \neq v$ **and** $diameter = \text{shortest-path } u \ v$

<proof>

lemma *radius-diameter-bounds*:

shows $radius \leq diameter$ $diameter \leq 2 * radius$

<proof>

end

We define various subclasses of the general connected graph, using the functor locale pattern

locale *connected-sgraph* = *sgraph* + *ne-graph-system* +

assumes *connected*: *is-connected-set* V

sublocale *connected-sgraph* \subseteq *connected-ulgraph*

<proof>

locale *fin-connected-sgraph* = *connected-sgraph* + *fin-sgraph*

sublocale *fin-connected-sgraph* \subseteq *fin-connected-ulgraph*

<proof>


```

end
theory Girth-Independence imports Connectivity
begin

```

4 Girth and Independence

We translate and extend on a number of definitions and lemmas on girth and independence from Noschinski's ugraph representation [4].

```

context sgraph
begin

```

```

definition girth :: enat where
  girth  $\equiv$  INF  $p \in$  cycles. enat (walk-length p)

```

```

lemma girth-acyclic: cycles = {}  $\implies$  girth =  $\infty$ 
<proof>

```

```

lemma girth-lte:  $c \in$  cycles  $\implies$  girth  $\leq$  walk-length c
<proof>

```

```

lemma girth-obtains:
  assumes girth  $\neq$  top
  obtains c where  $c \in$  cycles and walk-length c = girth
<proof>

```

```

lemma girthI:
  assumes  $c' \in$  cycles
  assumes  $\bigwedge c . c \in$  cycles  $\implies$  walk-length  $c' \leq$  walk-length c
  shows girth = walk-length  $c'$ 
<proof>

```

```

lemma (in fin-sgraph) girth-min-alt:
  assumes cycles  $\neq$  {}
  shows girth = Min (( $\lambda c .$  enat (walk-length c)) 'cycles) (is girth = Min ?A)
<proof>

```

```

definition is-independent-set :: 'a set  $\implies$  bool where
  is-independent-set vs  $\equiv$  vs  $\subseteq$  V  $\wedge$  (all-edges vs)  $\cap$  E = {}

```

A More mathematical way of thinking about it

```

lemma is-independent-alt: is-independent-set vs  $\longleftrightarrow$  vs  $\subseteq$  V  $\wedge$  ( $\forall v \in$  vs.  $\forall u \in$ 
vs.  $\neg$  vert-adj v u)
<proof>

```

```

lemma singleton-independent-set:  $v \in$  V  $\implies$  is-independent-set {v}
<proof>

```

definition *independent-sets* :: 'a set set **where**
independent-sets \equiv {vs. is-independent-set vs}

definition *independence-number* :: enat **where**
independence-number \equiv SUP vs \in independent-sets. enat (card vs)

abbreviation $\alpha \equiv$ *independence-number*

lemma *independent-sets-mono*:
vs \in independent-sets \implies us \subseteq vs \implies us \in independent-sets
<proof>

lemma *le-independence-iff*:
assumes $0 < k$
shows $k \leq \alpha \iff k \in \text{card } \text{'independent-sets}$ (is ?L \iff ?R)
<proof>

lemma *zero-less-independence*:
assumes $V \neq \{\}$
shows $0 < \alpha$
<proof>

end

context *fin-sgraph*
begin
lemma *fin-independent-sets*: finite (independent-sets)
<proof>

lemma *independence-le-card*:
shows $\alpha \leq \text{card } V$
<proof>

lemma *independence-fin*: $\alpha \neq \infty$
<proof>

lemma *independence-max-alt*: $V \neq \{\} \implies \alpha = \text{Max } ((\lambda \text{ vs} . \text{enat } (\text{card } \text{vs})) \text{'independent-sets})$
<proof>

lemma *independent-sets-ne*:
assumes $V \neq \{\}$
shows independent-sets $\neq \{\}$
<proof>

lemma *independence-obtains*:
assumes $V \neq \{\}$
obtains vs **where** is-independent-set vs **and** card vs = α
<proof>

end
end

5 Triangles in Graph

Triangles are an important tool in graph theory. This theory presents a number of basic definitions/lemmas which are useful for general reasoning using triangles. The definitions and lemmas in this theory are adapted from previous less general work in [2] and [1]

theory *Graph-Triangles* **imports** *Undirected-Graph-Basics*
HOL-Combinatorics.Multiset-Permutations
begin

Triangles don't make as much sense in a loop context, hence we restrict this to simple graphs

context *sgraph*
begin

definition *triangle-in-graph* :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow bool **where**
triangle-in-graph x y z \equiv $(\{x,y\} \in E) \wedge (\{y,z\} \in E) \wedge (\{x,z\} \in E)$

lemma *triangle-in-graph-edge-empty*: $E = \{\} \implies \neg \text{triangle-in-graph } x \ y \ z$
(*proof*)

definition *triangle-triples* **where**
triangle-triples X Y Z \equiv $\{(x,y,z) \in X \times Y \times Z. \text{triangle-in-graph } x \ y \ z\}$

definition
unique-triangles
 $\equiv \forall e \in E. \exists! T. \exists x \ y \ z. T = \{x,y,z\} \wedge \text{triangle-in-graph } x \ y \ z \wedge e \subseteq T$

definition *triangle-set* :: 'a set set
where *triangle-set* \equiv $\{\{x,y,z\} \mid x \ y \ z. \text{triangle-in-graph } x \ y \ z\}$

5.1 Preliminaries on Triangles in Graphs

lemma *card-triangle-triples-rotate*: $\text{card}(\text{triangle-triples } X \ Y \ Z) = \text{card}(\text{triangle-triples } Y \ Z \ X)$
(*proof*)

lemma *triangle-commu1*:
assumes *triangle-in-graph* x y z
shows *triangle-in-graph* y x z
(*proof*)

lemma *triangle-vertices-distinct1*:
assumes *tri*: *triangle-in-graph* x y z
shows $x \neq y$

<proof>

lemma *triangle-vertices-distinct2:*

assumes *triangle-in-graph x y z*

shows $y \neq z$

<proof>

lemma *triangle-vertices-distinct3:*

assumes *triangle-in-graph x y z*

shows $z \neq x$

<proof>

lemma *triangle-in-graph-edge-point:* $\text{triangle-in-graph } x \ y \ z \longleftrightarrow \{y, z\} \in E \wedge \text{vert-adj } x \ y \wedge \text{vert-adj } x \ z$

<proof>

lemma *edge-vertices-not-equal:*

assumes $\{x, y\} \in E$

shows $x \neq y$

<proof>

lemma *edge-btw-vertices-not-equal:*

assumes $(x, y) \in \text{all-edges-between } X \ Y$

shows $x \neq y$

<proof>

lemma *mk-triangle-from-ss-edges:*

assumes $(x, y) \in \text{all-edges-between } X \ Y$ **and** $(x, z) \in \text{all-edges-between } X \ Z$ **and** $(y, z) \in \text{all-edges-between } Y \ Z$

shows $(\text{triangle-in-graph } x \ y \ z)$

<proof>

lemma *triangle-in-graph-verts:*

assumes *triangle-in-graph x y z*

shows $x \in V \ y \in V \ z \in V$

<proof>

lemma *convert-triangle-rep-ss:*

assumes $X \subseteq V$ **and** $Y \subseteq V$ **and** $Z \subseteq V$

shows $\text{mk-triangle-set } \{ \{x, y, z\} \in X \times Y \times Z \mid (\text{triangle-in-graph } x \ y \ z) \} \subseteq \text{triangle-set}$

<proof>

lemma **(in fin-sgraph)** *finite-triangle-set:* *finite (triangle-set)*

<proof>

lemma *card-triangle-3:*

assumes $t \in \text{triangle-set}$

shows $\text{card } t = 3$

```

    <proof>

lemma triangle-set-power-set-ss: triangle-set  $\subseteq$  Pow V
    <proof>

lemma triangle-in-graph-ss:
    assumes  $E' \subseteq E$ 
    assumes sgraph.triangle-in-graph  $E' x y z$ 
    shows triangle-in-graph  $x y z$ 
    <proof>

lemma triangle-set-graph-edge-ss:
    assumes  $E' \subseteq E$ 
    shows (sgraph.triangle-set  $E'$ )  $\subseteq$  (triangle-set)
    <proof>

lemma (in fin-sgraph) triangle-set-graph-edge-ss-bound:
    assumes  $E' \subseteq E$ 
    shows card (triangle-set)  $\geq$  card (sgraph.triangle-set E')
    <proof>

end

locale triangle-free-graph = sgraph +
    assumes tri-free:  $\neg(\exists x y z. \textit{triangle-in-graph } x y z)$ 

lemma triangle-free-graph-empty:  $E = \{\}$   $\implies$  triangle-free-graph V E
    <proof>

context fin-sgraph
begin

    Converting between ordered and unordered triples for reasoning on cardinality

lemma card-convert-triangle-rep:
    assumes  $X \subseteq V$  and  $Y \subseteq V$  and  $Z \subseteq V$ 
    shows card (triangle-set)  $\geq$   $1/6 * \textit{card} \{(x, y, z) \in X \times Y \times Z . (\textit{triangle-in-graph } x y z)\}$ 
    (is  $- \geq 1/6 * \textit{card } ?TT$ )
    <proof>

lemma card-convert-triangle-rep-bound:
    fixes  $t :: \textit{real}$ 
    assumes card  $\{(x, y, z) \in X \times Y \times Z . (\textit{triangle-in-graph } x y z)\} \geq t$ 
    assumes  $X \subseteq V$  and  $Y \subseteq V$  and  $Z \subseteq V$ 
    shows card (triangle-set)  $\geq 1/6 * t$ 
    <proof>
end
end

```

theory *Bipartite-Graphs* **imports** *Undirected-Graph-Walks*
begin

6 Bipartite Graphs

An introductory library for reasoning on bipartite graphs.

6.1 Bipartite Set Up

All "edges", i.e. pairs, between any two sets

definition *all-bi-edges* :: 'a set \Rightarrow 'a set \Rightarrow 'a edge set **where**
all-bi-edges X Y \equiv *mk-edge* '(X \times Y)

lemma *all-bi-edges-alt*:

assumes X \cap Y = {}

shows *all-bi-edges* X Y = {e . card e = 2 \wedge e \cap X \neq {} \wedge e \cap Y \neq {}}

<proof>

lemma *all-bi-edges-alt2*: *all-bi-edges* X Y = {{x, y} | x y. x \in X \wedge y \in Y }

<proof>

lemma *all-bi-edges-wf*: e \in *all-bi-edges* X Y \implies e \subseteq X \cup Y

<proof>

lemma *all-bi-edges-2*: X \cap Y = {} \implies e \in *all-bi-edges* X Y \implies card e = 2

<proof>

lemma *all-bi-edges-main*: X \cap Y = {} \implies *all-bi-edges* X Y \subseteq *all-edges* (X \cup Y)

<proof>

lemma *all-bi-edges-finite*: finite X \implies finite Y \implies finite (*all-bi-edges* X Y)

<proof>

lemma *all-bi-edges-not-ssX*: X \cap Y = {} \implies e \in *all-bi-edges* X Y \implies \neg e \subseteq X

<proof>

lemma *all-bi-edges-sym*: *all-bi-edges* X Y = *all-bi-edges* Y X

<proof>

lemma *all-bi-edges-not-ssY*: X \cap Y = {} \implies e \in *all-bi-edges* X Y \implies \neg e \subseteq Y

<proof>

lemma *card-all-bi-edges*:

assumes finite X finite Y

assumes X \cap Y = {}

shows card (*all-bi-edges* X Y) = card X * card Y

<proof>

lemma (in *sgraph*) *all-edges-between-bi-subset*: *mk-edge* ‘ *all-edges-between* $X Y \subseteq$
all-bi-edges $X Y$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

6.2 Bipartite Graph Locale

For reasoning purposes, it is useful to explicitly label the two sets of vertices as X and Y . These are parameters in the locale

locale *bipartite-graph* = *graph-system* +
fixes $X Y :: 'a \text{ set}$
assumes *partition*: *partition-on* $V \{X, Y\}$
assumes *ne*: $X \neq Y$
assumes *edge-betw*: $e \in E \implies e \in \text{all-bi-edges } X Y$
begin

lemma *part-intersect-empty*: $X \cap Y = \{\}$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *X-not-empty*: $X \neq \{\}$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *Y-not-empty*: $Y \neq \{\}$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *XY-union*: $X \cup Y = V$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *card-edges-two*: $e \in E \implies \text{card } e = 2$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *partitions-ss*: $X \subseteq V \ Y \subseteq V$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end

By definition, we say an edge must be between X and Y , i.e. contains two vertices

sublocale *bipartite-graph* \subseteq *sgraph*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

context *bipartite-graph*
begin

abbreviation *density* \equiv *edge-density* $X Y$

lemma *bipartite-sym*: *bipartite-graph* $V E Y X$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *X-verts-not-adj*:

assumes $x1 \in X \ x2 \in X$
shows $\neg \text{vert-adj } x1 \ x2$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Y-verts-not-adj*:
assumes $y1 \in Y \ y2 \in Y$
shows $\neg \text{vert-adj } y1 \ y2$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *X-vert-adj-Y*: $x \in X \implies \text{vert-adj } x \ y \implies y \in Y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *Y-vert-adj-X*: $y \in Y \implies \text{vert-adj } y \ x \implies x \in X$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *neighbors-ss-eq-neighborhoodX*: $v \in X \implies \text{neighborhood } v = \text{neighbors-ss } v \ Y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *neighbors-ss-eq-neighborhoodY*: $v \in Y \implies \text{neighborhood } v = \text{neighbors-ss } v \ X$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *neighborhood-subset-oppX*: $v \in X \implies \text{neighborhood } v \subseteq X$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *neighborhood-subset-oppY*: $v \in Y \implies \text{neighborhood } v \subseteq Y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *degree-neighbors-ssX*: $v \in X \implies \text{degree } v = \text{card } (\text{neighbors-ss } v \ Y)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *degree-neighbors-ssY*: $v \in Y \implies \text{degree } v = \text{card } (\text{neighbors-ss } v \ X)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition *is-bicomplete*:: *bool where*
is-bicomplete $\equiv E = \text{all-bi-edges } X \ Y$

lemma *edge-betw-indiv*:
assumes $e \in E$
obtains $x \ y$ **where** $x \in X \ \wedge \ y \in Y \ \wedge \ e = \{x, y\}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *edges-between-equals-edge-set*: $\text{mk-edge } (\text{all-edges-between } X \ Y) = E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Lemmas for reasoning on walks and paths in a bipartite graph

lemma *walk-alternates*:
assumes *is-walk* w

assumes $Suc\ i < length\ w\ i \geq 0$
shows $w ! i \in X \longleftrightarrow w ! (i + 1) \in Y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

A useful reasoning pattern to mimic "wlog" statements for properties that are symmetric is to interpret the symmetric bipartite graph and then directly apply the lemma proven earlier

lemma *walk-alternates-sym*:
assumes *is-walk* w
assumes $Suc\ i < length\ w\ i \geq 0$
shows $w ! i \in Y \longleftrightarrow w ! (i + 1) \in X$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *walk-length-even*:
assumes *is-walk* w
assumes $hd\ w \in X$ **and** $last\ w \in X$
shows *even* (*walk-length* w)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *walk-length-even-sym*:
assumes *is-walk* w
assumes $hd\ w \in Y$
assumes $last\ w \in Y$
shows *even* (*walk-length* w)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *walk-length-odd*:
assumes *is-walk* w
assumes $hd\ w \in X$ **and** $last\ w \in Y$
shows *odd* (*walk-length* w)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *walk-length-odd-sym*:
assumes *is-walk* w
assumes $hd\ w \in Y$ **and** $last\ w \in X$
shows *odd* (*walk-length* w)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *walk-length-even-iff*:
assumes *is-walk* w
shows *even* (*walk-length* w) $\longleftrightarrow (hd\ w \in X \wedge last\ w \in X) \vee (hd\ w \in Y \wedge last\ w \in Y)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *walk-length-odd-iff*:
assumes *is-walk* w
shows *odd* (*walk-length* w) $\longleftrightarrow (hd\ w \in X \wedge last\ w \in Y) \vee (hd\ w \in Y \wedge last\ w \in X)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Classic basic theorem that a bipartite graph must not have any cycles with an odd length

lemma *no-odd-cycles*:
assumes *is-walk w*
assumes *odd (walk-length w)*
shows \neg *is-cycle w*
<proof>

end

A few properties rely on cardinality definitions that require the vertex sets to be finite

locale *fin-bipartite-graph = bipartite-graph + fin-graph-system*
begin

lemma *fin-bipartite-sym*: *fin-bipartite-graph V E Y X*
<proof>

lemma *partitions-finite*: *finite X finite Y*
<proof>

lemma *card-edges-between-set*: *card (all-edges-between X Y) = card E*
<proof>

lemma *density-simp*: *density = card (E) / ((card X) * (card Y))*
<proof>

lemma *edge-size-degree-sumY*: *card E = ($\sum y \in Y . degree y$)*
<proof>

lemma *edge-size-degree-sumX*: *card E = ($\sum y \in X . degree y$)*
<proof>

end

end

7 Graph Theory Inheritance

This theory aims to demonstrate the use of locales to transfer theorems between different graph/combinatorial structure representations

theory *Graph-Theory-Relations* **imports** *Undirected-Graph-Basics Bipartite-Graphs*

Design-Theory.Block-Designs Design-Theory.Group-Divisible-Designs
begin

7.1 Design Inheritance

A graph is a type of incidence system, and more specifically a type of combinatorial design. This section demonstrates the correspondence between designs and graphs

sublocale *graph-system* \subseteq *inc: incidence-system* *V mset-set E*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

sublocale *fin-graph-system* \subseteq *finc: finite-incidence-system* *V mset-set E*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

sublocale *fin-ulgraph* \subseteq *d: design* *V mset-set E*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

sublocale *fin-ulgraph* \subseteq *d: simple-design* *V mset-set E*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

locale *graph-has-edges* = *graph-system* +
assumes *edges-nempty: E* \neq $\{\}$

locale *fin-sgraph-wedges* = *fin-sgraph* + *graph-has-edges*

The simple graph definition of degree overlaps with the definition of a point replication number

sublocale *fin-sgraph-wedges* \subseteq *bd: block-design* *V mset-set E 2*
rewrites *point-replication-number* (*mset-set E*) *x* = *degree x*
and *points-index* (*mset-set E*) *vs* = *degree-set vs*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

locale *fin-bipartite-graph-wedges* = *fin-bipartite-graph* + *fin-sgraph-wedges*

sublocale *fin-bipartite-graph-wedges* \subseteq *group-design* *V mset-set E {X, Y}*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

7.2 Adjacency Relation Definition

Another common formal representation of graphs is as a vertex set and an adjacency relation. This is a useful representation in some contexts - we use locales to enable the transfer of results between the two representations, specifically the mutual sublocales approach

locale *graph-rel* =
fixes *vertices* :: 'a set (*V*)
fixes *adj-rel* :: 'a rel
assumes *wf: $\bigwedge u v. (u, v) \in adj-rel \implies u \in V \wedge v \in V$*
begin

abbreviation *adj u v* \equiv $(u, v) \in adj-rel$

lemma *wf-alt*: $adj\ u\ v \implies (u, v) \in V \times V$
<proof>

end

locale *ulgraph-rel* = *graph-rel* +
assumes *sym-adj*: *sym adj-rel*
begin

This definition makes sense in the context of an undirected graph

definition *edge-set*:: 'a *edge set* **where**
edge-set $\equiv \{\{u, v\} \mid u\ v.\ adj\ u\ v\}$

lemma *obtain-edge-pair-adj*:
assumes $e \in edge-set$
obtains $u\ v$ **where** $e = \{u, v\}$ **and** $adj\ u\ v$
<proof>

lemma *adj-to-edge-set-card*:
assumes $e \in edge-set$
shows $card\ e = 1 \vee card\ e = 2$
<proof>

lemma *adj-to-edge-set-card-lim*:
assumes $e \in edge-set$
shows $card\ e > 0 \wedge card\ e \leq 2$
<proof>

lemma *edge-set-wf*: $e \in edge-set \implies e \subseteq V$
<proof>

lemma *is-graph-system*: *graph-system* $V\ edge-set$
<proof>

lemma *sym-alt*: $adj\ u\ v \longleftrightarrow adj\ v\ u$
<proof>

lemma *is-ulgraph*: *ulgraph* $V\ edge-set$
<proof>

end

context *ulgraph*
begin

definition *adj-relation* :: 'a *rel* **where**
adj-relation $\equiv \{(u, v) \mid u\ v.\ vert-adj\ u\ v\}$

lemma *adj-relation-wf*: $(u, v) \in \text{adj-relation} \implies \{u, v\} \subseteq V$
<proof>

lemma *adj-relation-sym*: *sym adj-relation*
<proof>

lemma *is-ulgraph-rel*: *ulgraph-rel V adj-relation*
<proof>

Temporary interpretation - mutual sublocale setup

interpretation *ulgraph-rel V adj-relation* *<proof>*

lemma *vert-adj-rel-iff*:
assumes $u \in V \ v \in V$
shows $\text{vert-adj } u \ v \longleftrightarrow \text{adj } u \ v$
<proof>

lemma *edges-rel-is*: $E = \text{edge-set}$
<proof>

end

context *ulgraph-rel*
begin

Temporary interpretation - mutual sublocale setup

interpretation *ulgraph V edge-set* *<proof>*

lemma *rel-vert-adj-iff*: $\text{vert-adj } u \ v \longleftrightarrow \text{adj } u \ v$
<proof>

lemma *rel-item-is*: $(u, v) \in \text{adj-rel} \longleftrightarrow (u, v) \in \text{adj-relation}$
<proof>

lemma *rel-edges-is*: $\text{adj-rel} = \text{adj-relation}$
<proof>

end

sublocale $\text{ulgraph-rel} \subseteq \text{ulgraph } V \ \text{edge-set}$
rewrites $\text{ulgraph.adj-relation } \text{edge-set} = \text{adj-rel}$
<proof>

sublocale $\text{ulgraph} \subseteq \text{ulgraph-rel } V \ \text{adj-relation}$
rewrites $\text{ulgraph-rel.edge-set } \text{adj-relation} = E$
<proof>

locale $\text{sgraph-rel} = \text{ulgraph-rel} +$
assumes *irrefl-adj*: *irrefl adj-rel*

```

begin

lemma irrefl-alt:  $adj\ u\ v \implies u \neq v$ 
  <proof>

lemma edge-is-card2:
  assumes  $e \in edge\text{-}set$ 
  shows  $card\ e = 2$ 
  <proof>

lemma is-sgraph:  $sgraph\ V\ edge\text{-}set$ 
  <proof>

end

context sgraph
begin

lemma is-rel-irrefl-alt:
  assumes  $(u, v) \in adj\text{-}relation$ 
  shows  $u \neq v$ 
  <proof>

lemma is-rel-irrefl:  $irrefl\ adj\text{-}relation$ 
  <proof>

lemma is-sgraph-rel:  $sgraph\text{-}rel\ V\ adj\text{-}relation$ 
  <proof>

end

sublocale  $sgraph\text{-}rel \subseteq sgraph\ V\ edge\text{-}set$ 
  rewrites  $ulgraph.adj\text{-}relation\ edge\text{-}set = adj\text{-}rel$ 
  <proof>

sublocale  $sgraph \subseteq sgraph\text{-}rel\ V\ adj\text{-}relation$ 
  rewrites  $ulgraph\text{-}rel.edge\text{-}set\ adj\text{-}relation = E$ 
  <proof>

end
theory Undirected-Graphs-Root imports
  Undirected-Graph-Basics
  Undirected-Graph-Walks
  Connectivity
  Girth-Independence
  Graph-Triangles
  Bipartite-Graphs
  Graph-Theory-Relations
begin

```

end

References

- [1] C. Edmonds, A. Koutsoukou-Argyaki, and L. C. Paulson. Roth's Theorem on Arithmetic Progressions. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, Dec. 2021.
- [2] C. Edmonds, A. Koutsoukou-Argyaki, and L. C. Paulson. Szemerédi's Regularity Lemma. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, Nov. 2021.
- [3] L. Hupel. Properties of random graphs – subgraph containment. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, February 2014. https://isa-afp.org/entries/Random_Graph_Subgraph_Threshold.html, Formal proof development.
- [4] L. Noschinski. Proof Pearl: A Probabilistic Proof for the Girth-Chromatic Number Theorem. In *Interactive Theorem Proving. ITP 2012.*, volume 7406 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.
- [5] L. Noschinski. A Graph Library for Isabelle. *Mathematics in Computer Science*, 9(1):23–39, Mar. 2015. <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11786-014-0183-z>.